

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

OCTOBER 6, 2008

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

#### Present:

Chairman Harold Sanger  
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative (arrived at 5:50 p.m.)  
Craig Owens, City Manager  
Jim Liberman  
Mark Lopata  
Ron Reim

#### Absent:

Scott Wilson

#### Also Present:

Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney  
Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services  
Jason Jaggi, Planner

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

#### MINUTES

The minutes of the September 8, 2008 meeting were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, as presented, after having been previously distributed to each member.

The minutes of the September 15, 2008 meeting were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, as presented, after having been previously distributed to each member.

#### REVISION TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SITE PLAN (STORM WATER MITIGATION) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 159 N. BEMISTON AVE.

Mark Doering, project civil engineer, Steve Gelber, owner, Mr. James Mills, owner of 167 N. Bemiston, and John King, Attorney representing Mr. Mills were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this project was approved on November 26, 2007 with a condition that a connection be made to the storm sewer along Pershing Avenue. Since that time, the neighboring property owner requested the City consider other options as the new line would utilize the right-of-way that is located immediately adjacent to his retaining wall. The City considered the option of using the street, but was concerned about utilities. Therefore, after numerous discussions between the owner and both the Public Works and Planning Departments, a compromise plan was established. Catherine explained that this plan will allow mitigation utilizing pop-up bubblers in the lawn areas and a 50 gallon rain barrel at each downspout with overflow pipes connected to the storm laterals. The purpose would be to retain a portion of the water before it enters the right-of-way. While this is not an optimal solution and staff does not want to set a precedent of using City curbs for private storm water mitigation, the location of the construction and design of the lot does not allow for a different solution without creating a nuisance for the neighboring property and therefore, staff recommends approval with the condition that this compromise does not set a precedent.

Mr. Doering indicated that bubblers and four rain barrels (one at each downspout) will help dissipate the amount of water before it enters the right-of-way. He indicated that he has done calculations and that there will be less than 1 cubic feet of water per second. He stated that the previous structure generated .435 cfs and the new plan will generate .481 cfs; an increase of only .046 cfs across the entire site. He stated that he worked with Paul Wojciechowski to get to this proposal.

Chairman Sanger referred to the letter about the rain barrel. He stated that they are supposed to be 50 gallon barrels, but that the letter indicates 38 gallons.

Mr. Doering indicated that some storage is lost at the top of the barrel.

Jim Liberman asked what the rain barrels look like, what they are constructed of and if water will always be inside them.

Mr. Doering distributed a new rain barrel cut-sheet showing what the barrels will look like. He indicated that they are made of plastic and that the water will be used for re-harvesting.

Marc Lopata asked how long it will take to fill the rain barrels.

Mr. Doering indicated that they will retain very little water.

Chairman Sanger asked if there are other rain barrel designs available as the proposed barrels look like they belong in a farm house.

Jim Liberman asked if they can be buried.

Mr. Doering replied "no". He stated that there are several types available.

Marc Lopata indicated that based on his calculations, these barrels will fill up in 74 seconds, all rain water will go to the street and that the City is neglecting its obligation to mitigate storm water impact.

Mr. Doering stated that he did not run any calculations.

Marc Lopata asked why mitigation is not being done as originally approved.

Mr. King approached the podium, stating that he is representing the neighbor, James Mills.

Catherine Powers explained that the line would have to have run in the public right-of-way at the back of the sidewalk right next to Mr. Mills', who has a retaining wall in very close proximity to where the line would be installed. She indicated that staff has been trying to negotiate a solution. She stated that the lack of a storm sewer on North Bemiston is an unfortunate existing condition.

Marc Lopata stated that this is a very large house.

Catherine Powers agreed that this is not the optimal solution.

Mr. King indicated that it is his opinion that there is no easement and that Mr. Gelber has no right to put a line there.

Marc Lopata asked where the water from the driveway will go.

Mr. Doering indicated that the driveway water will flow to the street.

Mr. King stated that he and his client is satisfied with this solution.

Marc Lopata indicated that another 983 square feet of water runoff will come from the driveway. He made a motion to reject the proposal in favor of a better solution.

There was no second to the motion. Motion fails due to lack of a second.

Chairman Sanger made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and received the following roll call vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Ron Reim and Craig Owens. Nays: Marc Lopata and Jim Liberman. Motion carries.

#### CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – SECOND UNIT – 31 WEST BRENTMOOR PARK

Note: Steve Lichtenfeld arrived (5:50 p.m.).

Mr. Mark Critchfield, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for a conditional use permit to allow the existing second floor area above the existing attached garage to be used as a second unit. The proposed

project involves interior renovations consisting of new appliances, counters and bathroom fixtures. The area is existing and will continue to be accessed from the interior of the house. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit because the structure provides a kitchen, bath, sleeping and living space as designated by the Building Code. The owners anticipate the use as a second unit for occasional use by visiting relatives. Therefore, the structure must meet the requirements as contained in the City's Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Section 2.21, as follows:

SECTION 2.21 SECOND UNITS (CARRIAGE HOUSES / GRANNY UNITS). A second unit is a type of accessory structure, either attached or detached which provides complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation, and is located on the same site as the principal residence. Second units are permitted subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit, and the following criteria:

- Second Units are only permitted in the R-1 and R-2 Large Lot and Single Family Residential Dwelling Districts, respectively.
- If a second unit is to be occupied permanently, then the occupants must be related to the residents of the principle residence. The second unit occupants must be related by blood, marriage or adoption, or be employed by the principle residence and do work on the grounds.
- A second unit may not be rented, sold, transferred, or assigned separately from the principle residence. The owner shall record a deed restriction to this effect as part of the Conditional Use Permit process required for such second unit.
- Maximum living area for a second unit in the R-1 Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District is 2,000 square feet.
- Maximum living area for a second unit in the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District is 1,000 square feet.
- An accessory structure containing a second unit may not exceed twenty (20) feet in height or occupy more than thirty (30%) percent of the area of a required rear yard, but no accessory structure shall be closer than ten (10) feet to the principle building nor closer than five (5) feet from any side or rear property line.
- An accessory building that is not part of the principle structure shall be located not less than sixty (60) feet from the front property line.
- Required parking facilities (i.e. garage) may not be demolished or converted in order to construct a second unit, unless the required parking space(s) are replaced concomitantly on the site.
- Each second unit shall be provided with one (1) additional parking space in addition to the parking required for the principle residence.
- The second unit shall conform to the color, material, architectural style, and detailing of the principle residence and shall meet all other applicable building code requirements, zoning regulations, developments standards, and guidelines.
- A landscape plan, which provides for adequate screening of the second unit from neighboring properties, as determined by the Landscape Architect on contract with the City of Clayton.
- Any waiver from the above stated criteria will require approval of a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

The applicant has submitted plans for a renovation which will contain a living room, kitchen, bath, and sleeping room. In total, the amount of livable area is approximately 600 square feet, which is below the 2,000 square feet maximum allowed for second dwelling units in the R-1 Residential Zoning District. As proposed the second unit is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance provisions. Catherine indicated that staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen pursuant to the conditions contained in Section 2.21 of the Zoning Ordinance (outlined above).

Mr. Critchfield indicated that the portion of the house to be used as the second unit was the subject of an addition that was constructed last year. He indicated that there is no exterior access to this apartment unit above the garage, as an interior door provides access. He indicated that only interior renovations are proposed and that the apartment will be used by visiting relatives.

Chairman Sanger asked if the proposal meets Codes.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”.

Being no further questions or comments, Marc Lopata made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and received unanimous approval of the members.

#### BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT & RETAINING WALL – 1 W. WALINCA WALK

Seth Langton, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this adjustment is being requested due to the location of a retaining wall located on a small portion of the Walinca Terrace public Right-of-Way. The owners are requesting ownership of this area for private use including maintenance of the existing retaining wall and future landscape improvements. The plat, as presented, will create a minor adjustment to Lot 4 of the Walinca Walk Subdivision by conveying approximately 459 square feet of Right-of-Way. The original Lot 4 contained 4,854 square feet and if approved, the Adjusted Lot 4 will contain 5,314 square feet. Catherine stated that the plat shows a 1-foot wide easement to the City of Clayton adjacent to the curb for street maintenance purposes. Catherine indicated that staff is of the opinion that the proposed boundary adjustment represents a minor request and will transfer ownership and maintenance of an unneeded portion of the Walinca Terrace Right-of-Way. The Public Works Department has reviewed the plat and finds it acceptable. The R-2 District minimum lot requirement of 7,500 square feet is not applicable since this subdivision was approved under the Conditional Use Permit process. The Board of Aldermen is required to approve, by ordinance, the vacation of City rights-of-way. Staff recommends that the plat approval be conditioned upon the Board of Aldermen’s granting of the right-of-way vacation and recommends approval of the Plat with the following conditions:

1. That the plat be considered null and void if the Board of Aldermen denies the request for Right-of-Way vacation.

2. That the applicant provide a Mylar for the appropriate City of Clayton signatures per the Subdivision Ordinance requirements after the Board of Aldermen approves the Right-of-Way vacation;
3. That the applicant file the plat with the St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds office and submit proof of filing to the City within 30 days of Plan Commission approval and after the Board of Aldermen approves the Right-of-Way vacation.

Kevin O'Keefe advised the members that state law requires that the Board of Aldermen receive a recommendation on the right-of-way vacation and asked the Plan Commission to make such recommendation in addition to the vote for the Boundary Adjustment Plat.

Chairman Sanger asked if two separate votes are needed.

Kevin O'Keefe replied "yes".

Mr. Langton indicated that the owners desire to improve their property and that a triangular area of property owned by the City was discovered, so a call was placed to the City's Public Works Department about vacating this 450 square foot area for ownership by Timothy Graubert and Becky Parks. He indicated that the owners are also asking to replace the railroad tie wall with modular block.

Chairman Sanger asked if a portion of the wall was constructed on City property.

Catherine Powers replied "yes". She advised the members that she talked with Public Works Director, Paul Wojciechowski who was more than willing to discontinue maintenance of this right-of-way.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there are other rights-of-way along this street that may be subject to the same request.

Catherine Powers indicated that she does not believe so.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the 10' County water easement is affected by this.

Jason Jaggi replied "no".

Kevin O'Keefe asked that a script be included on the plat to read that approval of the plat does not represent the City's opinion as to the ownership.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if once the boundary adjustment plat is approved, the property would be owned by Tim and Becky.

Kevin O'Keefe indicated that he expects so, but he does not want the approval to convey that they have title. He asked that the script on the Mylar indicating such be submitted to the City Attorney's Office for acceptance.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the property owner whose property abuts this 450 square foot area have rights to this area.

Mr. Langton indicated that if they do, they also would have rights to Tim and Becky's driveway.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that he doubts that the property to the west is a part of it, depending on how the subdivision was platted originally.

Steve Lichtenfeld indicated that he does not want to be involved in an owners' war about ownership.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that would be for the owners to resolve.

Chairman Sanger questioned what the developer originally purchased.

Kevin O'Keefe indicated that it goes back to successors of the tract.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to recommend approval of the right-of-way vacation to the Board of Aldermen. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the members.

Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the boundary adjustment plat per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

Consideration of the proposed retaining walls began.

Catherine Powers indicated that the subject property is located at the west end of Walinca Terrace and the applicant is requesting the installation of a modular block retaining wall on both sides of the front yard driveway in support of other improvements to the property including landscaping and a small swimming pool. The modular block wall would replace existing tie walls which are showing signs of deterioration. An existing gray-colored modular block wall is located on the west end of the drive. The proposed wall would match this material on the west side. On the east side of the driveway, the brick-faced concrete retaining wall will remain. The proposed modular block wall will extend past the brick wall to the sidewalk. The maximum height of the wall will be 7-feet located near the below grade garage entry. Catherine stated that that the proposed modular block wall does not meet the architectural review material guidelines for front yard retaining walls; however, there are factors which seem to warrant consideration of a waiver. Several locations on this street contain the same wall material as proposed. Staff believes that these existing walls were provided by the developer when these residences were constructed, which was prior to the retaining wall material guidelines adopted by the Architectural Review Board. Staff

also believes that while brick faced retaining walls are preferred, the new walls will reduce the materials to two versus the three that are present (wood, brick and modular block) which will create a more consistent appearance with the rest of the street and therefore, recommends approval with the condition that a building permit be secured prior to installation.

Mr. Langton showed the members the location of the existing and new walls are located. A sample of the modular material was presented. He noted that they are not removing the wall on the proposed vacated property.

Chairman Sanger asked if the wall is 7 feet in height.

Mr. Langton indicated that it is only 7 feet in height at the back corner and it gets shorter as it approaches the street.

Marc Lopata asked if the front side is the east side.

Steve Lichtenfeld replied “yes”.

Marc Lopata indicated that he thought that modular block was not permitted in the front.

Catherine Powers stated that there are already a number of these walls along that street and that the existing railroad tie wall is in poor shape.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and unanimously approved by the members.

Chairman Sanger asked Mr. Langton to contact staff regarding the language for the Mylar.

#### ADDITION & RENOVATION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 48 HILLVALE

Mr. Mark Critchfield, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance were owners Andrew & Iva Youkilis.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for construction of a 2 story addition (including garage) to be located in place of an existing attached, rear entry garage in the rear of the house. The existing home is a brick, 3,880 square foot two-story Tudor-style structure located in Claverach Park. The proposed addition measures approximately 1,512 square feet (including the garage). Site plan review is not required because the addition is less than 50% of the square footage of the existing structure. The addition is primarily brick to match the existing residence. A small amount of cedar shingle siding is proposed on the south gable to match the existing residence. The east and west elevations feature stucco and stain timbering accents in keeping with the Tudor style. Decorative carriage-style garage doors are proposed on the east elevation. The addition will contain a stone veneer base to match the stone foundation of the existing residence. The height of the addition will be 25 feet from grade to the roof peak and will contain clay tiles to match existing. The windows are proposed to be a combination of casement and double-hung, brown in color to



match existing. The driveway will be modified to provide a side entry garage. A new exposed aggregate concrete driveway is proposed along the east side of the property. The plans show the driveway to extend 36-feet past the garage which is well beyond the need for a vehicle turnaround. To mitigate a grade change, new stone-faced retaining walls on both sides of the driveway up to 5'2" in height are shown on the plans. The wall will be located very near the neighboring property at 46 Hillvale; however, the footing detail shows that it will not encroach beyond the property line. The wall section adjacent to the residence will screen the trash receptacles and the HVAC units. Catherine indicated that as shown, the plans comply with impervious coverage and setback provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and that Claverach Park Trustee approval has been submitted. Catherine indicated that the proposed addition represents a high-quality design which will blend well with the existing residence. The proposed wall materials, roofing, and architectural detailing compliment the existing residence. While this project does not require site plan review or MSD approval, staff is concerned with the length of the reconfigured concrete driveway in the rear yard. The driveway is shown to be 36-feet beyond the garage and is located very close to neighboring properties. Staff feels that the length should be reduced to allow greater opportunities to control storm water runoff from the driveway. Staff recommends that the driveway area be reduced to no greater than 16-feet beyond the rear wall of the addition as shown on a previous design submitted to staff. This reduction will allow the day-lighted downspout laterals to be moved further back from the property line and therefore, staff recommends approval with the condition that the driveway extend no greater than 16-feet from the rear of the addition and the downspout laterals be moved back away from the property line for staff review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Critchfield indicated that the home was constructed in the late 20's to early 30's. Material samples (brick and stone) were presented. He stated that a mix stone will be used at the base of the addition and that the brick and roof will match existing. He stated that the 1,500 square foot addition (800 square foot footprint) consists of a 2 car lower level garage with a family room above.

Chairman Sanger asked about the driveway.

Mr. Critchfield indicated that the owners would like to have the extra driveway for field hockey and additional parking.

Marc Lopata commented that it appears that the neighborhood has some water issues already and that a smaller driveway would be better.

Chairman Sanger agreed.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ROOFTOP ANTENNA INSTALLATION – 950 FRANCIS PLACE

Mr. Jeffery Gray, with Network Real Estate on behalf of Cleartalk, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing to install three, 52-inch tall antennas on the roof of the subject building. The three (3) antennas will be centrally-located on the roof adjacent to an existing antenna facility and placed on a shared support mast. To screen the antennas, the applicant is proposing the use of a stealth canister. The equipment will be screened with a fiberglass wall enclosure to match the building. She stated staff believes that the project will not have a detrimental impact on the building and recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Gray indicated that the current rooftop equipment is not screened and that they believe this will be an improvement.

Jim Liberman asked if the antennas depicted on Sheet A4 are new.

Mr. Gray replied “yes”. He added that there are, although, other carrier’s equipment on the roof already as well as HVAC equipment.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and received unanimous approval of the Board.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW – BROWN SHOE PROJECT (PROJECT BEACON) – 8300, 8400, 8500 MARYLAND AVENUE & 61 TOPTON WAY

Due to a conflict of interest, Marc Lopata excused himself. He did not participate in the discussion with regard to this item.

Catherine Powers noted that since this is conceptual review, nothing that is said by either the City or the applicant is binding.

Mr. Bob Clark, CEO of Clayco (building and co-developer) was in attendance at the meeting. He introduced other project representatives as follows:

Mike Tobin, US Equities  
Gary Feder, Attorney  
Bob Wislow, US Equities  
Mike Convey  
David Hutkin  
Lance Cage  
Chris Cedergreen  
Andy Norman  
Larry Chapman

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for conceptual review of a Special Development District multi-phased, mixed use project to be located at the west end of Clayton. This project includes Brown Shoe’s Corporate Headquarters as well as a combination of office, retail and residential uses. Catherine indicated that the proposed redevelopment would occupy

several properties fronting the south side of Maryland Avenue, currently used by Brown Shoe Company, as well as the adjacent surface parking lot at 61 Topton Way. Additionally, the Center of Clayton and Clayton High School parking areas would receive modifications to support the development. Combined, the sites total approximately 12.8 acres. Catherine provided an explanation of the phases as follows:

Phase I:

This phase would contain two office building components totaling 645,500 square feet; one component would be five (5) stories (75 feet tall) and the other would be seventeen (17) stories (275 feet tall). The office building would contain 90 parking spaces beneath. The front, shorter portion would be constructed of glass curtain wall and aluminum. The taller portion is proposed to be constructed of a combination of brick and glass curtain wall. To the rear of the office building would be a 9 level, 110 feet in height parking structure proposed to be constructed of primarily architectural pre-cast concrete. This garage would contain 1,700 parking spaces. Also proposed is the re-alignment of Gay Avenue, a new parking lot for Clayton High School and the Center of Clayton.

Phase II:

This phase will contain two office buildings on the east side of the newly constructed Gay Avenue. The front office building is proposed to be eight (8) stories in height containing 224,000 square feet and will feature retail/commercial on the ground floor, which will extend along Maryland Avenue and south toward the parking structure. The plans indicate 33,700 square feet of retail/commercial facing Maryland Avenue. There will be parking in front of the retail along Maryland Avenue. The second office building, proposed to be fourteen (14) stories in height, will be located south of the first building and consist of a total of 400,000 square feet. Additionally, a residential tower and an additional 33,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor are anticipated in Phase II. The fourteen (14) story residential tower will contain 116 units. To support Phase II, a multi-level, 2,000 space parking structure is proposed.

Phase III:

Phase III is anticipated to contain two residential towers and supporting parking. The thirteen (13) story residential south tower will be located south of the Phase II residential tower and will consist of 90 units. A total of 135 parking spaces will be added to the parking garage in support of the residential building. Finally, Phase III contains another residential building on the east side of Topton Way. This thirteen (13) story building is proposed to contain 100 units with below grade parking.

Catherine indicated that the entire project will consist of approximately 2,821,168 square feet of building area, a Floor Area Ratio of 5.20, and approximately 3,925 parking spaces. Catherine stated that the proposed development would add a significant amount of office and residential space

to Clayton and provide a retail/commercial presence to this area of Clayton. Catherine indicated that City staff is enthusiastic about the possibility of bringing new vitality to this area which would create a new identity to the western business district. Traffic mitigation, site plan and architectural review issues will be discussed in detail in the near future. Staff requests that the Board review the proposal and provide the developer input.

Mr. Clark indicated that they began work on this complex, multi-phased project approximately 18 months ago and that it has been through various design stages. He stated that the project involves property that they own and property that they do not own and that infrastructure is involved. He indicated that they went through two successful public forums and that they have overwhelming support from the RCBA and the state. He indicated that the plans have been refined but that for the most part, the project has gotten better.

Chairman Sanger asked Mr. Clark to indicate where the plans have changed since the last presentation.

Mr. Clark agreed. He began a PowerPoint presentation, stating that the project creates an economic engine and will allow Brown Shoe to remain here. He stated that the project will be LEED Certified and that they visited the Country to try and emulate terrific spaces. He stated that the site is not all that great and that the existing building does not reflect a world class company. He stated the site has a lot of water run-off. He stated that the project includes a new Gay Avenue, a new road to Topton Way and a new entry to the City's Recreation Center. He indicated that a narrower landscape area is now being provided by the parking garage in Phase I.

Chairman Sanger asked about the construction schedule.

Mr. Clark indicated that they hope to begin construction within a few months and hope to have completed by the end of 2010. He stated the plan is to immediately move the employees out and demo the existing building and that the idea is to build as much of Phase II as possible. He stated that they believe that between 18 months and 2 years they will have enough leasing to begin Phase II. He indicated that two hotels are interested in the project, but that obviously the market is a factor.

Chairman Sanger asked the size of the hotel.

Mr. Clark indicated approximately 8,400 square feet.

Chairman Sanger asked what will happen if there is no hotel.

Mr. Clark indicated that if there is no hotel, Phase I would include approximately 600,000 square feet of office space, 60,000 square feet of retail and 420 residential units. He stated that Brown Shoe will occupy 435,000 square feet (all but the top 5 stories) of the 654,000 square foot Phase I office tower. He stated that Phase I includes a 5 story office tower with a green roof, a 17 story office tower (with a connection to the garage), and a 1,700 space garage. He indicated that the buildings are to be a 2 color brick (no pre-cast) with large windows and that some brick will be on the garage.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked about the value creation of the current mulch pile area.

Mr. Clark indicated that it is fair to say that the current mulch pile site is “junky” and that the project will create value and turn the recreation center into a great place. He mentioned the possibility of a bicycle trail and location of MetroLink extension. He indicated that the project is designed to accommodate MetroLink, which probably won’t occur for about 15 years.

Jim Liberman asked if MetroLink was taken into consideration when parking numbers were projected.

Mr. Clark replied “no”. He stated he believes the project to be over parked.

Jim Liberman commented that the garage will dwarf the Center of Clayton. He asked if there is any way to give it more breathing room.

Mr. Clark indicated that he does not know how. He stated that there is 60 feet of landscape area between the garage and the roundabout.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that there is a potential to increase the value of not only the mulch pile area, but all properties on the western edge of Clayton to Highway 170.

Chairman Sanger asked when retail will arrive.

Mr. Clark indicated that retail will arrive at the onset of Phase II. He indicated that the hotel is the driving force for Phase II and if there is no hotel, more retail will be added (up to 70,000 square feet). He added that he hopes the plan will “trick” motorists into the first level of the free, well lit, high ceiling garage.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the east/west distributor road will be two or four lanes.

Mr. Clark indicated that it will be two wide lanes.

Ron Reim asked if the Center of Clayton users will be parking in the garage.

Mr. Clark replied “yes”.

Chairman Sanger asked staff if the City has any concerns regarding the project.

Catherine Powers indicated that staff is working with the developer to provide more detail. She stated that there is still a lot of work to be done.

Mr. Clark agreed.

Jim Liberman commented that the project looks great.

Chairman Sanger agreed.

Mr. Jack Hambene, University Drive resident, indicated that he is very supportive of the plan and is happy about saving a corporate citizen. He stated that the first thing people will see is the parking (along Maryland) and suggested the building be moved closer to the street.

Mr. Sheldon Johnson, representing his mother who lives at 15 Tipton Way, commented about traffic issues and asked that the residents be considered.

Mr. Tom Jones, Crandon resident, asked that there be no parking on Maryland Avenue.

Being no further questions or comments, Chairman Sanger thanked Mr. Clark for the presentation and stated that he is looking forward to the next presentation. He stated he finds the project terrific, but may have concerns with Phase II.

Steve Lichtenfeld added "and Phase III".

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary